

WHOLE NO. 580.

Mr. C. *Lenox Remond* then mounted the rostrum, and spoke for about 20 minutes.* He said he had felt almost discouraged as to the success of the anti-slavery enterprise—his heart had been pained at what he had seen and heard for some time past—but the proceedings of the last two or three days had given him fresh courage. He said that the meetings had begun—he had been rejoiced to see the spirit manifested here—and last evening, when he attended a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society in the State House of Massachusetts, and saw a fugitive slave occupying the Speaker's chair, it was indeed most gratifying to him; and he could not but feel that he had accomplished nothing so satisfactory as his attendance upon those introduced, and the remarks which had fallen from those who had preceded him. He said he had for years been satisfied of the truth of the charge, that the church and the clergy were the great bulwarks of slavery, and not, as was often said, the bulwarks of morality and religion—and he rejoiced that this Society had now taken the most courageous and noble stand, to pull down the towers to be shattered down and demolish those bulwarks. He dissented from the idea advanced by Friend Fuller, that abolitionists should remain in the churches, in order to exert an influence upon them—he said that he had tried this course for five years, but he found that the churches, instead of reforming, were becoming worse and worse—and about 18 months ago he had taken the course of withdrawing himself from the churches, and he was now fully and firmly convinced that while he allowed himself to be considered a member, he was guilty of supporting the abominable system of slavery, of which the church was the main pillar. He said it was difficult

—And, indeed, no man could be a true abolitionist, and get into a meeting-house many times, because his object is to poll down the house, and sweep Rogers out of it. He went all lengths with Rogers in denouncing the clergy and the church, and said those who connected themselves with churches became there, tools and instruments in the hands of clerical despots, and he called upon all abolitionists in the churches to withdraw from them.

Abigail Polson then rose, and began to deliver her testimony against all church organizations, anti-slavery as well as others. Her speech was interrupted by the chairman, who asked her to sit down and let a young colored man address the meeting. Abigail replied:—*No; I wish to speak myself now!*—and she went on in her usual strain till I obliged her to leave the Hall.

The remarks of Rogers and Remond were received with great applause. On one occasion, especially, when he attacked the church and the clergy, the audience were frequently roused to the cry of—*Amen! — Good! — That's right!* &c., from various parts of the house. Indeed, had it not been announced that it was a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society, I should have supposed myself in a meeting of *Kneelaudites* or *Infidels*.

At the highest terms, who, I heard, had not been present at their meetings, owing to the dangerous illness of his sister, and other members of his family.

P. S. I understand that the above resolutions were this afternoon adopted by the Society, with but two or three dissenting voices!

* A mistake. It was Frederick Douglass, and not C. L. Remond, who spoke on this occasion.—*Ed. Lib.*

The Anti-Slavery Meeting at the State House.

The Representatives' Hall was filled last evening at an early hour, and the exercises were continued until a late hour. There was an abundance of good speaking, and of that intense zeal and burning enthusiasm for which anti-slavery meetings are so distinguished.

The audience was first addressed by Col. J. P. Miller, of Montpelier, Vermont, a man of iron frame and nerve, with something of the Ethan Allen quality about him, and of a dashy and forcible style of speaking. He went through some years since to Greece, from New-York, to superintend the supplies that were sent out to the aid of that *then* suffering country, and discharged his message with signal courage and good fortune.

The eccentric George Bradburn, of Nantucket, whom every body knows as having been for some years in our State Legislature, followed, and said some very bitter things about politicians, especially whigs, and the clergy, than we recollect were to have heard before. His friend Park, and other whigs, who opposed the grant of the Representatives' Hall to the Anti-Slavery Society, were roasted over a slow fire most effectually. His wit and scorching ridicule, hitting here and there, and among names and faces, called down thunders of applause.

Charles Lenox Remond, an educated young man of color, and native of this State, who has lately returned from Great Britain, where he was treated with great distinction by the nobility, next took the stand, and made a very neat speech, which, for style and execution, would be well received in any assembly.

Dr. D. B. Reed, editor of the N. H. Herald of

quinnance at Plymouth, N. H. and Mr. Fuller, a Quaker gentleman, now of New-York, and a British subject, then made a few general remarks.

The eloquent and talented Wendell Phillips, a member of one of our noblest families, and who always, in speaking, uses 'thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,' next addressed the hall of the assembly, and made an appeal at once brilliant in style and lucid in argument.

He was succeeded by Frederick Douglas, once a slave at the South, whence he escaped quite recently—who made, perhaps, although void of any regular education, the best speech of the evening, every thing considered. He showed great initiative powers, and gave forth, in a most forcible manner, preaching to slaves, and the corresponding practice, which seemed to interest the meeting greatly. His native talents are evidently of a high order.

A lady next appeared in the Speaker's chair, with a rich but plain Quaker dress, her dark hair smoothed down from the forehead, and her eyes, glowing with the power of her feelings, and her voice, with the earnest, deep hue, with beautifully curved lip, and full melting eye, and open brow of alabaster—all in quiet keeping with maidenly modesty—the celebrated Abby Kelley—who, with her sweetly melodious, yet trumpet tones, poured forth her woman soul in denouncing the wrongs of the colored man, and the deep and earnestness of her sisterhood.

It was a touching piece of eloquence, and if we were ever so prone to oppress our fellows, that angel voice would at once call us back from things of earth to bow in submissiveness at the shrine of her beauty and her gentleness. No wonder that the abolitionists produce a sensation in the

After a few remarks from Mr. Garrison, the assembly, evidently gratified with the entertainment, separated for their respective homes.

Extract of a letter from James Cannings Fuller to the Editors of the Anti-Slavery Standard :

After holding five meetings in the Melodeon, the sixth was held in the State-house, and crowded full. Some had to stand four and a half hours; yet they declared they were not tired, so interesting was the meeting. It was a favor to be in attendance, to be

cheered, warmed, and encouraged to urge onward the sacred cause of freedom, by the soul-stirring speeches of Jonathan Miller, from Vermont, (better known by the cognomen of colonel, of Greek celebrity,) the eloquent Phillips, the truth-spoken Bradburn, and many others; with such partizan bravado, by this agreeable variety, were all tastes suited. But over and above all this, I would mention the *spirit* in which the business was conducted; it was most gratifying. The covering spread at times over the meeting, reminded me of the rainy days of our cause, and brought to recollection some of the sittings of the London Convention. Two other sittings were held in the Melodeon. On the evening of the sixth day, a meeting of the citizens of Boston was held in Faneuil Hall, to receive and hear the Irish Address, which is signed by Daniel O'Connell, Father Mathew, and sixty thousand Irishmen, to their fellow-countrymen on this side of the Atlantic. I wish I could convey a description of this enthusiastic meeting. My pen is insufficient for the task, and pictorial representation inadequate to the scene. It must be seen, to be appreciated. It is said not less than five thousand persons were present; and a large number of them from the Emerald Isle, whose honest hearts, whole souls, and every nerve were in the cause, the longest to the contents of the address. Their repeated huzzas, and cheers, both on the resolutions and remarks of the many speakers, showed there was a war of feeling kindled, which I trust will not soon subside. The Chairman of this last meeting was one, who of all men was entitled to that distinction; his name is Garrison. For his head, Georgia offers \$5000; his neck, Massachusetts would give \$10000; his heart, the whole of the United States follow his example. Stranger things than this have come to pass within my recollection. What a change of feeling there must be in Boston since 1835. Now the Old Cradle of Liberty opened to the abolitionists, that they and the Irish in the city might meet to rock liberty on its cradle. The crowded hall, and the eye of the multitude needed consolation, it was before them when they beheld looking down on them, Washington, John Hancock, General Warren, the founder of the Hall, and last, though not least, the sturdy defender of the right of petition, John Quincy Adams.

No man can tell what may be the result of this last meeting on our cause. Irish huzzas beat high for liberty, and then where you may. If they did not, they could not as Catholics take shelter in the church. I think I can bless the God of Heaven that the anti-slavery cause has for its defenders the Pope of Rome, and among the laity such men as Daniel O'Connell, Theobald Mathew, Fred. Madden, all of Ireland, and the many prominent characters in communion in England, and especially in France. Let the adopted citizens of America labor to extend to all the inhabitants of the land, the freedom which they themselves came here to enjoy, and to hand down to their posterity, and the days of slavery are numbered. The hearts of hundreds, if not thousands, who were at the meeting, are pledged to the advocacy of the principles of the Address, just as much as though they had received the pledge of eternal hostility from Father Mathew; and I doubt not they will do so, if the seed sown be nurtured by our Boston friends. They have promised to do so; they have the ability, and I hope the determination of purpose to redeem the promise. It is their privilege to cultivate and direct the Irish in the advocacy of liberty for all mankind, irrespective of color or clime.

Frederick Douglass, the fugitive from slavery, was in attendance; and it is saying but little that in the Melodeon, as well as the State House, and Faneuil Hall, he shone brightly. Both Frederick and Lunsford Lane are noble specimens of humanity, and made them more than slaves, made them into chivalry. They possess powerful minds, and are logical reasoners. Lunsford had an opportunity to tell the story of his wife, and their six children, all of whom are now in bondage in North Carolina. Their so-called owner says they are worth \$3000; but as Lunsford paid \$4000 for him, and his wife disposed to let them go for \$2500. A collection was taken up to aid him, and \$103 were contributed. He is now minus about \$400.

Our Boston friends have large hearts, keep open house, and love free discussion. If you want your spirits refreshed, and your countenances sharpened by meeting a brotherhood of men and women, go to humanity, go if you can to the next anniversary, or the annual meeting of the New-England Society; and take a long and deep draught with them at the pure fountain of abolitionism. In saying this, I wish it to be understood that they advocate moral suasion, and the carrying of anti-slavery morality into every department of life; that they may lead us to the Kingdom of God, by blessing on all their endeavors that are consistent with our Heavenly Father's will, I subscribe myself their obliged and affectionate friend.

JAMES C. FULLER.

From the Herald of Freedom, of the 11th instant:

Of the meeting during the day, we learn nothing—but we hear that the evening meeting was an enthusiastic and most glorious affair. Five thousand people, it is said, thronged in and about the Hall, and in their responses to the speeches of the occasion, made the Old Cradle of Liberty ring in their ears. TWO THOUSAND IRISHMEN were there—and when the Address of O'Connell and Father Mathew, and the sixty thousand men of Ireland, to the Irishmen of America, urging them to join the Abolitionists, was read—they made the Old Hall ring again! God bless the Irish heart every where! It always sympathizes with the wronged. We had been there to hear, and shout for Liberty with them. If the Old Cradle is to have another such rocking, we hereby request our friend John A. Collins, who we think will have a hand in the matter, to give us due notice, that we may be there too.

A real genuine, (none of your counterfeit) LIBERTY MEETING IN THE OLD HALL!—THE TWO THOUSAND IRISHMEN in attendance!—Thinking of that, American Despots. Yes—and the meeting addressed by Wendell Phillips and Edmund Quincy—old revolutionary blood courses there! And Charles Lenox Remond, a BLACK MAN—Frederick DOUGLASS, a RUNAWAY SLAVE!!! Think of that, ye miserable flesh-mongers that are trying to keep the people of this country in the chains of slavery by your infamous Congress—a *Justice* playing the Sam Adams before a Boston audience in Faneuil Hall—did you ever hear of Faneuil Hall before, or of the spirit that haunts it?—and all amid the most enthusiastic cheering! Ay—and all more fact for your William Lloyd Garrison in the Chair! Think of these things, ye traitors, ye cowards—for your end draweth nigh, and your destruction is even now waiting at the door! Immediate repentance is your only safety.

From the same paper of the 11th inst.

We have recently witnessed some of the most magnificent meetings ever held in the Old Bay State since the starting of the anti-slavery enterprise. The People of the Land are swelling the triumphs and lengthening the train of anti-slavery in Massachusetts. Down-trodden and outlawed Humanity there, holds her gatherings not now in Julien Hall or Chardon Street stables, but in the ample Marlborough and Melodeon. The haughty State House stage upon its portals to the 'niggers' and the 'fanatics,' and the Speaker's platform is trodden by the fugitive slave, while the old legislative amphitheatre around it sends back responsive thunders to the incendiary interrogatories of Garrison; and Faneuil Hall rocks like the sky in a thunder storm, as he ascends the Chair amid tempests of acclamation, to preside over the meetings of the People. We check our exultation to watch its influence on the Cause. We dread the courtesy of the politicians, as the old Trojan Priest dreaded the Greeks, and the gifts they brought. They may prove as disastrous to anti-slavery as the Trojan horse did to the 'heaven-defended' city.

At a capital trial, and with an auditory of a kind not often found at an anti-slavery meeting, Friend Miller, led the way on the platform in his heroic vein, and was heard with much applause. He charges an audience, as Mustard used to charge at the head of a squadron of cavalry. It would take some time after him for them to get drowsy, under the tamest speakers. But tame speakers did not follow him. George Bradburn rose next, evidently feeling himself in his peculiar element, and on an evening he had never before. He was greeted as a veteran Athlete, by the legislative portion of the auditory, and with tumultuous plaudits by the whole; and he sustained himself through a considerably prolonged speech, with every variety of forensic ability and eloquence. He was followed by Charles Lenox Remond, who well maintained his laurels, won as an elegant, correct and forcible speaker, and a man of great address. The meeting paid him the most respectful and profound attention, and had Quaker Stephen Chase, the railroad overseer, been there, he would sooner have thought of taking passage himself in the boiler of the engine, than of asking the colored orator to the Jim Crow car.

We followed Remond with a word or two on the injustice and *injustice* of the colored prejudice, and a brief recital of some of his recollections in public and private, when we were with him in Europe. We think it would have been an awkward business for any body to have shown him any disrespect, that evening, in that assembly. The cry then rose from all quarters, for Wendell Phillips, the Boston Orator, modern Othello, and that noble, his address, his spirits, and imparted an interesting tenderness and solemnity to his remarks. We have never known him speak so well.

The next speaker who trod the platform was the fugitive Douglass. We have before spoken of this extraordinary man. He is about three years from his second escape from the grasp of the law, and a human ox. It is truly astonishing that such manly and lofty developments as he exhibits, could have taken place under that unspeakable system. He has the port, and countenance, and heroic assurance, and almost the stature of the Roman Cincinnatus, and we could but rejoice in enthusiasm of spirit, as he presented himself to the gaze of the assembled assembly. He reminded us of the 'African Chief' in the verses—all but the chains, which he had spurned from his limbs—

'Chain'd in the market place he stood,
A man of giant frame,
Amid the gathering multitude,
That shrank to hear his name.'

Garrison announced him, in his peculiarly arousing manner, as 'a thing from the South!' The idea seemed to fire the noble fugitive with indignation of outraged nature. His eye flashed as he spoke, and his voice was stern and significant, declaring that 'he stood before them, not a thief and a robber! This head, these limbs, this body, said he, 'I have stolen from my master!' We wish the United States Senate, and the poor slave master Tyler and his dark Secretary, who but for his politics and his degeneracy, were a brother and a man for the noble Douglass, had been present to witness his bearing in that stern and significant manner. He spoke of the young American in the Committee, in himself urging a member to move an election of chairman, and the manner of his disclosing and using the minutes of the Committee; I will say, that for me to vote for him would be, after these circumstances, to endorse his sentiments and to sanction his conduct, which I cannot do. Therefore, I should be bound in my sense of public duty to vote for some other person as chairman.

It would have been agreeable to my feelings, if I could have been relieved from serving on the Committee for several weeks past.

You are at liberty to make known the contents of this communication.

(Signed) W. COST JOHNSON.

Hon. T. W. GILMER.

The letters were read, and Messrs. Gilmer, Hunter, Rhet, Profit, and Johnson were excused, at their request, from further service on the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

ending in a series of high-toned anti-slavery resolutions, went off in fine style. We have never heard better principles of liberty, or purer democracy advanced any where at any time. The principles of liberty, with J. Q. Adams at the head, are beginning once more to prevail, and the principles of slavery to be viewed in their proper light.—*Lynn Record.*

We attended a grand, glorious, sublime anti-slavery meeting at Faneuil Hall, Boston, last Friday evening. It was held for the purpose of annulling the great Irish Address, and it was worthy of the occasion.

Garrison was in the Chair, and Quincy, Phillips, J. C. Fuller, Remond, Douglas, and Bradburn made speeches; just such speeches as we like, (so far as we heard them) and well calculated to promote the great work of the anti-slavery enterprise. The hall was full to overflowing. The galleries were crowded with ladies, and the floor with hundreds of the sons of Erin; and the way the children of the Emerald Isle received the Address of 60,000 IRISHMEN, HEADED BY DANIEL O'CONNELL and THEOBALD MATHEW, urging them to join the Abolitionists, and to shun the slave trade, only, made pro-slavery politicians pale.

Never did old Hall open its doors to a more immense multitude—never did its old walls ring with louder and more enthusiastic cheer. The spirit of '76 is reviving again. The glorious work of liberation is begun, and it must be completed. Events are converging to the grand catastrophe, and slavery hastens to its death under the hand of moral and political action.—*N. H. People's Advocate.*

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Wednesday, Feb. 9th.

Mr. Waddy Thompson, of South Carolina, has been nominated as Minister to Mexico, and Washington Irving, of New-York, as Minister to Spain.

The Adams Case.

In the House, this morning, Mr. Gilmer presented the following communication, addressed to the Speaker:

February 8, 1842.

The undersigned, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, respectfully ask the House to excuse them from further service on that Committee. Recent occurrences induce them to doubt whether the removal of the present chairman of the Committee would meet the approbation of the House, and they are unwilling to serve with a chairman who has avowed opinions and persevered in a system of conduct which, in the estimation of the undersigned, have shown him to be an unsafe depository of this public trust, or of that confidence which is necessary to the relation between a chairman and the members of such a committee.

THOS. W. GILMER,
R. M. T. HUNTER,
R. BARNWELL RHETT,
GEORGE H. PROFIT.

To the Hon. the Speaker,
of the House of Representatives.

This communication was accompanied by the following letter from Mr. Johnson:

TUESDAY MORNING, 8th Feb., 1842.

DEAR SIR:

Indisposition will prevent my attending the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning; but if it should be of the slightest importance to know what would be my course upon the vote to elect a new chairman, I cannot do so. Therefore, I should be bound in my sense of public duty to vote for some other person as chairman.

It would have been agreeable to my feelings, if I could have been relieved from serving on the Committee for several weeks past.

You are at liberty to make known the contents of this communication.

(Signed) W. COST JOHNSON.

Hon. T. W. GILMER.

The letters were read, and Messrs. Gilmer, Hunter, Rhet, Profit, and Johnson were excused, at their request, from further service on the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

(Reported for the Liberator.)

Appearance before the Legislative Committee.

RAIL-ROAD CORPORATIONS, &c.

Feb. 10th, 1842.

The Representatives' Chamber was filled with deeply interested listeners at the hour appointed, and Wendell Phillips first addressed the Committee:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appear before you in behalf of those persons, whose signatures are affixed to the numerous petitions now in the hands of the House, for redress of various grievances growing out of the existence of slavery. They may be described as consisting of five different kinds:—Those relating to the Rail-road Corporations—those on Florida—those that regard the course of the Senators and Representatives in Congress, with respect to the fugitive slave, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on the subject of Congress—those relating to the rules and orders of Congress—those relating to the various points of discussion on the subject with Great Britain—and those on the denial of the rights of citizenship at the South. I shall confine myself principally to those on the rail-road question, though I touch upon the others, as they are connected with some of the other points now before the Legislature. I suppose the Committee to be aware of certain facts, of common notoriety, such as these:—That, at some of the rail-road, depots, colored citizens, though paying the highest price for tickets, are not permitted to ride in the first class of cars, after having been refused a ticket to ride in cars decent enough by themselves, or condemned to ride in uncomfortable low or conveyance in the inferior class of cars, called the 'Jim Crow cars.' I suppose the committee to be aware, also, of the various outrages upon the persons, the feelings, and the rights of these citizens, perpetrated at the instance of the rail-road corporations, especially within the last year, and the numerous cases, in which they have been forcibly dragged from the cars with unnecessary violence, and sometimes driven from the rail-road, so that they were not able to go that time, however important and pressing might be their affairs. It is upon such facts as these, that the petitions before you are based. And it is upon such facts, that the Legislature may be taken by the redress of this grievance, either by the passage of a declaratory law, or such other action as shall be thought best calculated, effectually and forever, to prevent their recurrence. There can be but two objections to such action on the part of the Legislature. It might be said, first, that they have no right to take it; or, second, that it is not worth while.

Now as to the right of the Legislature to take the requisite action, there seems no reasonable ground of objection; for these corporations owe their existence, in the first place, to an act of the Commonwealth. They are sustained by its funds, and protected by its arms. The Legislature creates, of course, it can control them. They are bound to make reports, from time to time, of their proceedings to it. That fact presupposes the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. The making of such a report would be a useless mockery, if the Legislature were not permitted to regulate their proceedings. And with regard to the particular action required, no reasonable doubt that the Legislature have the right to make it. These corporations are public servants, and are therefore bound to serve in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth; and all their by-laws must be in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the State. It is for the benefit of the public, that the Legislature should have the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments, for the public service and the public good, that they should be required to do nothing contravening the service and laws of the Commonwealth. The Legislature has the right to regulate their proceedings, if need be. It is not as individuals that they should be dealt with, whose cases can be left to common law; but it is as corporations, existing by your special enactments,

POETRY.

THE DYING SLAVE. MOTHER.

BY G. S. BURLEIGH.

From the Liberty Bell.
Come to my dying bed,
Brother, and raise my head,
That I may see you sunset clouds awhile,
That in bright colors dress,
Hang o'er the blushing West,
Cloud upon cloud upheaved, a glorious pile!
O, when the sun went down
Last night, in shadows brown,
What then I saw no human tongue can tell!
On such a sunlit cloud,
There came an angel crowd,
Such as afar in heaven's bright mansion dwell:
And bending lowly down,
Had lent me a crown,
But that I had not quite forgiven the wrong,
And all the evil done
By the oppressive one,
Who long hath bound us in his fetters strong.
They turned, and in the sky
Wheeled their bright ranks on high,
And waved the token from the clouds above,
And as they soared, they sang
Till heaven's blue temple rang
With songs of Hope, of Mercy, and of Love.
I saw amid that band,
With golden lyre in hand,
My murdered Leon, whom the robber slew;
To me, how passing fair
His ebon features were,
Amid that bright and glorious throng, to view.
And there my darling boy
Poured out such songs of joy,
As make my spirit leap with rapture now,
While cherubs, rosy fair,
Hovered above in air,
And bound a garland on his sable brow.

Forward from his bright cloud,
My gentle Leon bowed,
And smiling, waved to me his chainless hand,
And still he swept the lyre
In concert with the choir,
As came his soft voice on the zephyrs bland.
"Mother, O come to me!
Come where the slave is free,
In the blest land where tears may never flow;
Here is no cooling whip,
Whose cruel lashes drip
With gore, as threatens in its path below;
But all is joy, and peace,
And love that cannot cease,
And rest, the hunted seek in vain on earth;
The dark lure of the skin
Is no foul mark of sin,
But hand in hand the ransomed all go forth.
"The holy men of old,
Of whom thou oft hast told,
When midmost bound the oppressor's eyes in sleep,
They stand around the throne,
To God, in solemn tone,
Striking their lyres, with never-ceasing sweep.
"And O! enthroned with Him,
Whom all the Seraphim
With heart and tongue, in burning ranks, adore,
And to whom Angels raise
Loud songs of endless praise,
God in the highest, now, and evermore,
"Is that meek Man of Woe,
Who died long years ago,
On Calvary's brow, for men of every life;
O love Him ever, Mother!
Like Him there is no other,
So meek, so gentle, and so Obedient too.
"When Death's dark valley through,
My trembling spirit flew,
I sunk in fear, to think that I was dead;
But when the Saviour spoke,
Words of such kindness broke
From His pure lips, that all my terror fled.
"Mother, O Mother, come!
Come to thy peaceful home;
Here is no tyrant with his cruel chain;
But cherubs, all their days,
Sing to the Lord in praise,
And to the Lamb, that on the earth was slain.
Then, as their rapturous song
Died on the air around,
And the soft sunshine faded from the sky,
The glittering ranks rolled back
Upon their joyous track,
And darkness settled on the dazzled eye.
And, Brother! I will go,
And leave this home of woe,
Its joys and griefs, its fetter-links, and tears,
And with my Boy above,
Join in sweet songs, of love
And praise to God, through all eternity!
Upon yon cloud-hill's brow,
I see my Leon now,
Waving his hand from his bright home to me;
O God! forgive the wrong,
That man hath done me long—
Brother, farewell! My Boy, I fly to thee!
Plainfield, Nov. 11, 1841.

GELON, KING OF SYRACUSE.

"The most beautiful treaty of peace ever spoken of in history, I believe to be that which Gelon made with the Carthaginians. He required of them that they should abolish the custom of sacrificing their own children. How admirable! After having defeated three hundred thousand Carthaginians, he exacted of them a condition, useful only to themselves; or rather he stipulated for the human race."—Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws, Book 10, chap. 5.

GELON OF SYRACUSE.—A SONNET.

BY JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Spirit of Gelon! from the realms on high,
Canst thou not come and visit earth once more?
Angel of Light! the world of man explore;
Refine his virtues! fit him for the sky!
Thy palm of conquest still may time defy,
Still bloom perennial from the days of yore!
Come! to thy conquered foes at once restore
The blessing loss of Nature's holiest fire.
See! in this land of Freedom's darling choice,
The pallid parent, deaf to Nature's voice,
Dooms his own offspring to the servile chain!
Oh! come and conquer! then thy law proclaim,
And bind the Anglo-Saxon father's fame,
Never to sacrifice his child again.

SONNET.

BY WM. W. STONE.

Put back the swelling ocean with thy hand!
Leash up the winds—the seasons' course control,
Then quench the burning spirit, like a coal,
And puff Hope's breath away, by which 'tis fanned—
But never until then, nor surer stand,
The feeble stars, that circle round the pole,
Than Truth and Justice in the immortal soul,
Which man can see not out with Slavery's brand.
All noble souls will yearn to the oppressor,
Nor cast thou that that inward sympathy,
That tide-like swellings ever in the breast,
Even as the restless sea of the broad sea
Heaves its fresh waters up to purify
The stagnant pools, that on the marshes lie.
Dec. 3, 1841.

NON-RESISTANCE.

Physical Resistance to Oppression.

MR. EDITOR:

In the Liberator of the 5th inst. I read, with great satisfaction, an address of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, expressly disclaiming all approbation of the doctrine, that the slaves in the United States would be right or justified in any attempt to recover their freedom by force of arms; and showing by sufficient documentary evidence, that the Society has ever disavowed any resort to physical force. In the same paper, (page 19) I read, with amazement, a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, in these words:—That, by all the principles on which we eulogize George Washington and his brave compatriots, who delivered their countrymen from the chain of British oppression, we are bound to laud the courage and heroism of the Americans on board the Creole, who, rising on their oppressors, secured to themselves, by their own strong arm, the inalienable right of liberty, of which American citizens had most basely robbed them.

My surprise at this resolution was certainly not diminished at perceiving that the Chairman of the Committee, who introduced it, was the highly respected President of the Non-Resistance Society, and usually a most thorough reprobator of the law of force. This apparent inconsistency has perplexed me, and several of my friends; and I would respectfully ask of you the question, whether the American and Massachusetts Societies differ on this point; and if the former is more pacific in its sentiments than the latter, whether the esteemed reporter of the resolution has changed his view on this subject, or in what manner the discrepancy between the pacific doctrine of the A. A. S. S. and the strong approbation of the insurgents of the Creole in the resolution can be reconciled. In replying to this, you will confer a favor on a member of the M. A. S. S. and a subscriber to your paper.

Feb. 7, 1842.

J. P. B.

Letter from H. C. Wright.

Hanover, N. H.—Lectured three times here, in the Baptist house, on Sunday. Several of the Congregational churches were present—absenting themselves from communion, which was administered that day by Archibald Burgess, minister of Congregationalism, (not of Christ.) Archibald Burgess and his church advocate slavery, and are, therefore, as a consequence, several of the members refuse to fellowship the sectarian compact as a church of Christ, or pay its consecrated and hired agent. Archibald Burgess came down upon non-resistance and Oberlin perfection with all his specific gravity, (which is not small,) and kept over the communion, as he administered the bread and wine, who were, however, holding, war-making church, because so many of the members were absent to hear that dangerous man who is trying to overthrow the churches. The precious seed of non-resistance and human brotherhood has taken root in some hearts here, and persecution and excommunication will not choke its growth.

My companion (John Orvis) went into Archibald Burgess's meeting Sunday evening, and into the monthly concert for missions, to speak a word for Peace and for the slave. Both times he waited for A. Burgess to get through—then arose to speak, but was dragged and kicked out of the house by two church members, NATHAN WOOD and JOSEPH HILL, in presence of A. Burgess, who were, however, strikingly on. Archibald Burgess is regarded as a minister of Christ, and his church as the church of Christ, by all the Congregational churches and ministers of the State and of New England.

The Congregational churches in New England thrust out and lynch men for daring to come into their meetings to rebuke them for their support of slavery and war. They will not allow anti-slavery and non-resistance to be introduced and discussed. "Lynch all who do it," is their cry. In imitation of their example, a convention of their brother slaveholders and war-makers at Annapolis, thrust brother C. T. TORNEY by their presence, and lynch him for daring to come into their meetings to report their proceedings. The same spirit of violence, of slavery and war, that actuated the Convention in Annapolis, actuates their conductors, the churches of New-England. In neither can Humanity or Christianity have a hearing. Those who hold up the sectarian, pro-slavery, lynch churches of New-England as the churches of Christ, are, therefore, making the lynchers of Annapolis may say to their make-believe Christian brother lynchers of New-England, "pull the beam out of your own eyes first."

But SELF-DEFENCE is the plea in both cases. The Convention at Annapolis met to defend slavery—to devise means and means to protect and perpetuate the system of violence and blood. C. T. Torrey came among them to note their proceedings on that murderous system. The slaveholders must give up slavery and be abolitionists, or lynch their enemies. Believing in the right and duty of armed defence, they chose the latter. The Congregational churches of New-England, determined to hold Christian fellowship with these monstrous slave and man-killers of Annapolis, meet together to devise ways and means to revive and spread Congregationalism, with its slavery and war. Men come into their meetings to rebuke them and call them to repentance. They must repent and become anti-slavery and non-resistance, or cast them out. Believing in the right and duty of military resistance, these churches drag and kick them out of doors. They must do it, or perish. But in both cases their determination to continue in their wickedness—their theft and murder—creates the necessity. The necessity is as justifiable as their determination to support slavery and war; and no more.

South Woodstock, Vt.—Delivered two lectures here, two lectures in East Randolph, and three in West Bethel. In each of these places, the general impression on the minds of all who heard, was that non-resistance is Christianity—that Christ was a non-resistance, and that we must be, in order to be his followers. BUT—it is not adapted to the present state of society! This is the universal cry against it, and in this objection the clergy lead. They say, while men are determined to continue as they now are, we must have military defence; no other protection can avail. Thanks to our opponents for their testimony in favor of non-resistance; for no greater evidence can be adduced that it is of God, than the fact that it is opposed to the present state of society. What is that state? A state of violence, anarchy and blood; which state Christianity comes to change to one of love, peace and order.

In West Bethel, the clergymen (Garfield and Abbott) opposed, and I could not get into the sectarian houses in the day time. I went into a hall, where the town's people met.

Royalton, Vt., Jan. 19.—I came here—found the Congregational churches of Windsor county met here in convention, to revive the spirit of Congregationalism. Went in and heard an account of the state of the church in several towns. In all but one, the complaint was of "a low time"—a "dark time"—a "cold time"—difficulties in the church unsettled—"run-drinkers" in the church, hoped to get them out—"wanted a protracted meeting, to get up a revival"—nothing could save but a revival, &c. &c. War-makers and slaves are in all the churches; but these are not worth mentioning. Slaveholders and war-makers can be good ministers and Congregationalists, but the run-drinkers must be ousted. Run-drinking is unpopular; war and slavery are popular. This makes the difference. Soon as slavery and war become as unpopular as drunkenness, these too, will be frowned upon by all the sects and their clergy. Paying ministers, going to meeting and joining the church, were the great tests of Christian character in this church convention. Fidelity to sects and their agents is the popular test. It went always so.

Right opposite the sectarian house is the town house. A State military convention was in session to revise the military spirit of the State. I attended this in the afternoon. Several Colonels, Majors and Captains, from different parts of the State, were there, devising ways and means to revive the militia system and improve it. One resolution was adopted, "recommending to all the commissioned officers of the State to throw up their commissions, unless the legislature would alter the militia system." Another was adopted, declaring that well regulated bands of music were necessary to the prosperity of the militia system. Congregationalism and the militia go hand in hand, and always have; and the licensed and ordained leaders of the former have no more of the loving, forgiving spirit

of Jesus, than the cocked and spanned leaders of the latter. Both are commissioned only by men. There wasn't so much *unforgiveness* in the militia as in the Congregational convention; but there appeared to be more contempt, more naturalness, more humanity. It did not look so cold and heartless. The President (General Ransom) acted more like a man, a human being, than did his commissioned brother, Reverend Mr. Drake, the presiding officer of the church convention. The Reverend sat in a large armed chair, and looked very awful; the General sat on a hard plain board, and looked more familiar, and like a common man. But Christianity rejects the titles and self-importance of both.

In the evening, and on the following evening, I lectured in the town-house, on the following propositions:

(1.) That military defence, in individuals and nations, is a virtual rejection of Christianity.
(2.) That danger to property, liberty and life, in any nation, is in proportion to its means of military defence.

Endeavored to show that military defence, and all who sustained it, are hostile to God and man—and to warn the people against training, and supporting man-making ministers and churches. About one hundred present, and heard with attention. Bought many pamphlets and tracts.

The Methodists have had a long protracted meeting to revive Methodism. The Congregationalists have made arrangements to hold a long protracted meeting to revive Congregationalism. Both sects are alike hostile to anti-slavery and non-resistance.

East Bethel, January 27. Here I am, as good as laid up, with inflammation and fever on my lungs. What with lecturing and riding in storm and sunshine, day and night, in Vermont and New Hampshire, I am fairly conquered; so I must go off the stage, for a season, or be carried off. An enemy hath broken into the citadel of my life. To that I must yield. I am waiting to leave Vermont and New-England, and go to my home in Philadelphia, to recruit. I am now resting with PATTEN and LOUISA DAVIS. If affection and sympathy can win hearts, theirs ought to have won mine. They have truly been to me brother and sister. There is a difference between me and them. Their house and hearts have been a home to me. Non-resistance, anti-slavery and temperance, on the East of the Green Mountains, have ever found warm friends in them. Humanity pronounces them blessed. May the Divine Award say to them—Well done—enter into the joy of your Lord! They have already entered into it, for they feel that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—THE FREE AMERICAN.

What Does It Mean?

In an editorial in the "Emancipator and Free American," conducted by Joshua Leavitt, I recently saw a strong condemnation of the punishment of death for crime, and a desire expressed that it might be stricken from the statute books. An abolition of capital punishment, as a matter of principle, involves the whole question of non-resistance, as any one can see. It is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has committed murder, it must be wrong to kill him before, and for the mere intention. The whole question of armed defence is involved in that of capital punishment. If the punishment of death is wrong, armed defence is also wrong. None have said more bitterly against non-resistance than Joshua Leavitt, A. A. Phelps, C. T. Torrey, and others. Yet, as Nathaniel Colver, and the supporters of the Free American. None have tried harder to make it be believed that to "love enemies," "forgive injuries," "return good for evil," and "resist not evil," as understood by non-resistance, is infidelity, French Jacobinism, anarchy and blood. Yet that "Free American" now asserts that capital punishment is a war to kill a man, after he has